



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/710,143	11/10/2000	Erin M. Bourke-Dunphy	MS160275.1	4603	
27195 7590 01/13/2004			EXAMINER		
AMIN & TUROCY, LLP			TANG, KUO LIANG J		
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER 1900 EAST NINTH STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CLEVELAND, OH 44114			2122	9	
			DATE MAILED: 01/13/2004	4 <i>O</i>	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	_	Pre,			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
·· Advisory Action	09/710,143	BOURKE-DUNPHY ET AL.			
•	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Kuo-Liang J Tang	2122			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	 a timely filed amendment whi 	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of	•				
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The da	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP			
nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three most earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 	•				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:				
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);			
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	pelow);				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the	9		
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejections.	ction(s):				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment			
5.☐ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se		sidered but does NOT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: 1-21.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.			
. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	_			

.

. . 🛪

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments filed 12/23/2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "installation location" which should be entailed "location" as described per specification as pg. 2, In. 25-26, 31-32 and page 3, In. 2-4;) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

TUAN DAM SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER